

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21 RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring the preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the question from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply". Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe the your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or to provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

This is a blanket checklist and threshold determination of nonsignificance for revisions to some types of older surface mine reclamation plans. This proposal will result in improved reclamation as specified in RCW 78.44.091 through 78.44.141. It will also reduce the number of mining operations that will reclaim according to poor-quality older-generation plans under a grandfathering provision in RCW 78.44. This checklist is applicable to revised reclamation plans that will result in:

- (a) Flatter slopes,
- (b) More sinuous, rounded topography,
- (c) Improved successional revegetation,
- (d) New wetlands, lakes, and/or drainages,
- (e) Topsoil/synthetic soil budgets and restoration,
- (f) Fill spotting, and compaction plans,
- (g) Rough natural-appearing cliffs [where permissible under state and local law],
- (h) Creating or enhancing fish and wildlife habitat,
- (i) Developing rough natural-appearing cliffs [where permissible under state and local law], and/or
- (j) Providing for segmental phased reclamation.

This checklist will not be used for proposals to revise reclamation plans that require any of the following approvals:

- (a) A rezone, modification of the approved subsequent use, or other land-use determination of any local governments with jurisdiction,
- (b) A shorelines permit [RCW 90.58],
- (c) A metal mining permit [RCW 78.56], or
- (d) State water allocation laws [RCW 90.03, 90.44].

This checklist does not apply to those revised reclamation plans for which significant concern from local citizenry is anticipated.

2. Name of applicant:

Department of Natural Resources

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Department of Natural Resources
MS 47007
Olympia, WA 98504-7007

360-902-1450 William Lingley or Dave Norman

4. Date checklist prepared:

December 27, 1995.

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Department of Natural Resources

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): Schedule for this SEPA action is [date]

This checklist and the accompanying determination of nonsignificance will be adopted for use in analyzing some revised reclamation plans that will be analyzed after February 1, 1996. Only those revised reclamation plans meeting the criteria set out below will be analyzed with this checklist.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Similar SEPA actions may occur in future, see response to Question 6 above.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

SEPA analyses prepared for individual surface mine reclamation or land-use permits issued between July 1, 1971, and January 1, 1995.

All of the minimum reclamation standards, set forth in detail in RCW 78.44.141, will be required for revised reclamation plans addressed with this checklist. In addition, miners will be required to comply with various procedures described in the following:

Norman, D. K., 1992, Reclamation of quarries: Washington Geology, v. 21, no. 3, p. 20-31.

Norman, D. K.; Lingley, W. S., Jr., 1992, Reclamation of sand and gravel mines: Washington Geology, v. 20, no. 3, p. 20-31.

Lingley, W. S., Jr.; Norman, D. K., 1991, Surface mining and surface mining law in Washington: Washington Geology, v. 19, no. 4, p. 38-48.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No other approvals or proposals will affect the proposed surface mine. Only those revised reclamation plans that are not contingent on approvals from other agencies are analyzed with this checklist. Revisions to reclamation plans considered substantial, such as proposals that may adversely affect ground-water quality, will be subject to site-specific checklists and individual threshold determinations.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

NOTE THAT STATE JURISDICTION FOR SURFACE MINE RECLAMATION PREEMPTS LOCAL JURISDICTION (RCW 78.44.011, 78.44.020) AND THAT ONLY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES MAY APPROVE REVISED RECLAMATION PLANS (RCW 78.44.091).

Alterations to any part of the scope of mining, such as a increase in the depth or area, of preexisting reclamation plans, including all proposals needing approvals of other agencies, are not analyzed under this checklist.

11. Give a brief but complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agency may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

Revised reclamation plans must substantially meet the protections, mitigations, and reclamation goals of RCW 78.44.091 and 78.44.131 (see RCW 78.44.081), as enumerated in RCW 78.44.141. These rigorous standards were adopted by the Legislature in 1993. Such revised plans will achieve improved slope stability, more effective revegetation, better surface- and ground-water control, reduced erosion, and other improved reclamation results.

This SEPA checklist addresses only those proposals to revise reclamation plans that will result in tangible improvements in the mine remediation scheme; changes to reclamation plans considered substantial by the department, such as all proposals that may adversely affect ground-water quality, will be subject to site-specific SEPA review.

Changes that may be reviewed under this SEPA checklist are:

- (a) Flattening the final slope,
- (b) Providing rounded, sinuous contours,
- (c) Assuring that final slope angles have a varied, natural appearance,

- (d) Removing rectilinear topographic elements,
- (e) Creating or enhancing fish and wildlife habitat,
- (f) Developing topsoil salvage and replacement sequences that will preserve organic carbon and microfauna/flora in the topsoil,
- (g) Planning for multi-species successional revegetation,
- (h) Planning fill for sources, spotting, and compaction,
- (i) Developing rough natural-appearing cliffs [where permissible under state and local law].
- (j) Creating new and effective wetlands, lakes, and drainages,
- (k) Clarifying existing plans with maps and cross-sections, and/or
- (l) Planning for phased or segmental reclamation.

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographical map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any applications related to this checklist.

Revised reclamation plans for individual reclamation permits that meet the thresholds provided herein will adopt this checklist and will be published in the SEPA register. These reclamation plans will be available for review at DNR Regional Offices.

The area affected includes surface mine sites at many locations across the State of Washington.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountains, other _____.

Surface mine sites have varying topography. Sand and gravel mines eligible for review under this SEPA action will have final slopes between two or three horizontal to one vertical (2-3H:1V). Other terrain typical of the sites will be flat and/or rolling pit floors. Quarries generally will have steep slopes. Some quarries may have vertical cliffs.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Slopes will vary as described in Element 1a above.

c. What general types of soils (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Sand, gravel, silt, clay, and/or bedrock. Soils will vary from site to site.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Sites with a history of slope instability will not be analyzed under this checklist; individual SEPA declarations will be prepared for such mines at a later date.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

A plan of backfill pursuant to RCW 78.44 will be included if substantial amounts of backfill are proposed for reclamation of a mine site. If such backfill is composed of materials other than clean sand, gravel, rock, concrete, or topsoil, those sites will be not analyzed under this checklist, and an individual SEPA analysis will be prepared at a later date.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Yes, minor erosion may occur while the revised reclamation plan is being implemented. Once implemented, this class of modifications to reclamation plans will result in markedly reduced erosion relative to preexisting reclamation plans. Erosion control that will be implemented may include such measures as development of synthetic riparian zones and thorough revegetation.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

This will vary by mine site, but in each case, improved reclamation will result in significantly reduced erosion relative to the existing reclamation plan.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Generally permits reviewed with this checklist would rely on passive no-maintenance methods of erosion control such as vegetation. Other typical no-maintenance methods might include ditches, swales, or ponds.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from this proposal (i.e. dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Dust emissions, though low, will vary by mine site, but at each site, improved reclamation will result in significantly reduced emissions relative to the existing reclamation plan. During reclamation minor emissions will come from equipment used for earth sculpting.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

None.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Reclamation would minimize dust because of revegetation or other dust-control measures.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Ponds, lakes, wetlands, and newly or re-constructed streams may be formed as part of reclamation.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

No projects reviewed under this DNS and environmental checklist will be within 200 feet of pre-mining bodies of water. Mines within 200 feet of waters under Shoreline Management Act jurisdiction will not be analyzed under this checklist; an individual threshold determination will be prepared at a later date.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of the fill material.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

Modified reclamation plans will show where water pathways and potential runoff will occur. All runoff will meet all State requirements for discharge from reclaimed mines.

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

The only source of runoff at surface mines reviewed under this SEPA DNS and environmental checklist is stormwater. Reclamation plans will generally describe thorough revegetation as a means of controlling runoff. However, a wide array of Best Management Practices may be used to control water. Modified plans which show revegetated, flatter, and more natural slopes will be implemented to reduce stormwater runoff.

- 2) Could waste material enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Not as a result of improved reclamation planning.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

As noted above, modified plans will show final contours that are flatter, natural appearing, and revegetated. These measures will have positive effects on water quality.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:
 - ___ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
 - ___ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
 - ___ shrubs
 - ___ grass
 - ___ pasture
 - ___ crop or grain
 - ___ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other
 - ___ water plants: water lily, eel-grass, milfoil, other
 - ___ other types of vegetation.

Generally, vegetation has been stripped from the site as part of the mining process.

Implementing the revised reclamation plan will introduce native, successional species and limit incursion by noxious varieties. (See references cited above in "Background", Section 8.)

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

Only vegetation that will preclude establishing stable slopes will be removed (e.g., vegetative "cornices" above over-steepened working faces). Care will be taken to preserve other vegetation; for example, fill will not be placed against the bases of evergreen trees. In each case, the new vegetation scheme will be an improvement over the scheme given in the current approved reclamation plan.

- c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Mines known to have threatened or endangered species present are not eligible for review under this SEPA DNS and environmental checklist.

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: Some modified reclamation plans will show revegetation plans which often times incorporate use of native plants. Others may not.

Modified reclamation plans may identify areas that will preserve existing vegetation.

5. Animals

- a. List any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

Impacts on wildlife are not generally considered when reviewing modifications to reclamation plans that improve habitat. However, almost all species listed are present at some mine sites in the state. For example, a site that is currently among the two or three largest sand and gravel mines in the United States has a large heron rookery and several deer have been sighted. Animals commonly observed include birds (hawks, herons, eagles, ducks, shorebirds, songbirds) and mammals (deer, elk), and still-water fish.

Care will be taken to preserve habitat and to assure that reclamation does not adversely affect these communities.

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None are known to occur at existing mine sites. However, if any threatened or endangered species are known or suspected to be on or near a site, modified reclamation plans for the site will not be analyzed with this checklist.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Sites that are part of migration routes are not eligible for this SEPA review.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Many revised reclamation plans will include enhancements for fish and wildlife. These include increased use of native vegetation, topography conducive to protection of wildlife, and creation of water sources.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electrical, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Mostly diesel fuel to run heavy equipment.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Use of passive water-control methods rather than active methods that would require fuel and maintenance.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Fuel or fertilizers could be spilled during reclamation, but this is unlikely.

- 1) Describe any emergency services that might be required.
- 2) Propose measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Modified reclamation plans will not increase the need for emergency medical services above and beyond what is already required for these mine sites.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Modified reclamation plans will not increase noise at existing mine sites. Ultimately, noise will be reduced.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Heavy equipment may be needed to push dirt on a short-term basis. This would generally not be noisier than equipment that has previously operated at the site.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Revegetation and some new topographic elements of reclaimed land may reduce ambient noise.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

No proposals involving rezoning or changes to the subsequent use of the mine site approved by the appropriate local government will be analyzed with this checklist. Current conditions for sites are surface mines. Adjacent property uses vary widely.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

Many of these pre-existing mine site were previously used for agricultural uses. These sites will be reclaimed for agricultural subsequent uses unless the local government with jurisdiction has previously approved a different subsequent use for the site.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Equipment recycling [bone] piles, scale-houses, workshops, and offices are commonly present on site.

d. Will any structures be demolished? if so, what?

Scale houses and bone piles (conveyor belt and other heavy equipment recycling storage areas) will be removed except at sites where the approved subsequent use is industrial. Buildings that are judged to be capital improvements to the land will not be removed, unless such buildings conflict with the pre-approved subsequent use (e.g., wildlife sanctuaries).

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Current zoning classification varies widely. Modification of the reclamation plans does not change the zoning nor the approved subsequent use of the site.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Current comprehensive plan designation of the site varies, but these designations will not be altered by this proposal.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Sites needing a Shoreline Permit are not evaluated under this checklist.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Sites classified as a critical area are not evaluated under this checklist.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

This will vary as a function of pre-existing zoning.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

None.

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

All mine sites have had approval of existing operations by local governments.

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing.

Not applicable to mine reclamation.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Not applicable to mine reclamation.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

Not applicable to mine reclamation.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

No structures will be built as part of this plan. Revegetation under this plan will generally include tall-growing trees that are found in the pre-existing and/or off-site forests adjacent to the mine.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

Views of mines will be improved by modifications to reclamation plans because more natural appearing slopes and better revegetation will result.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

The revised reclamation plan is largely designed as an exhaustive measure to reduce and mitigate pre-existing aesthetic impacts of surface mines. Those measures conform with all of the standards outlined in RCW 78.44.141: "Minimum Reclamation Standards".

11. Light and Glare

- a. What kind of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

No light and glare beyond that common for currently approved mining practices at any site should occur.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

None.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreation opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Recreational opportunities near, or at, each mine that will have an improved reclamation plan will be enhanced by implementation of the improved reclamation scheme. For example, plant/soil ecosystems and large-fauna habitat will be improved by implementing the new plan.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreational opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

Some revised reclamation plans analyzed with this checklist will provide improved fishing or opportunities for other outdoor sports.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Sites that are listed on, or proposed for preservation registers are not covered under this checklist.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Sites that have evidence of historic, archeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site are not covered under this checklist. The pre-1996 SEPA analysis will be confirmed with a site-specific TRAX check that will remain on file with the reclamation plan.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

NA

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans if any.

Public streets will be shown on individual reclamation plans.

- b. Is the site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

None. (Not applicable for mine reclamation.)

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

Not generally.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

Only a small number of mines will generate any additional traffic whatsoever. The small minority that will, however, would use only those dump trucks necessary to provide additional sand, gravel, rock, topsoil, or clean concrete requisite to complete the reclamation plan. Generally, this will be less than 50 trips per day for less than two months.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Not applicable for mine reclamation.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____

Raymond Lasmanis

Date Submitted: _____

December 27, 1995

Approved by: Raymond Lasmanis

Title: Division Manager, Geology and Earth Resources
Department of Natural Resources

Date: _____

December 27, 1995

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS
(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

This is a proposal designed to reduce these impacts.

In the long term [after reclamation is complete], these improved reclamation plans will markedly reduce all forms of pollution relative to those associated with older-generation reclamation plans. This proposal will reduce the number of mining operations that will reclaim according to poor-quality older-generation plans under a grandfathering provision in RCW 78.44.

In the short term, minor noise, air emissions, and water discharge could occur, but these would be at the same levels as those anticipated and evaluated under SEPA as part of the initial mine-site evaluation.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

This proposal is specifically designed to reduce pollution.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

This proposal will improve wildlife habitat through more effective mine reclamation.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

None necessary, see above and various provisos on the attached checklist.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Not applicable, see provisos on the attached checklist. Mine reclamation almost never impinges on transportation services.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Not applicable, see above.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

Many of the thresholds and provisos given on the attached checklist were designed to assure that this proposal to improve older reclamation plans would not conflict with any other permits or approvals that may be required to protect the environment from mine-related impacts. See the following publication for a complete list of these permits:

Norman, D. K., 1994, Surface Mining in Washington: Regulatory responsibilities of federal, state, and local government agencies: Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Open File Report 94-4, 26 p.

Description of this Nonproject Proposal:

This checklist and threshold determination of nonsignificance for revisions to some types of older, poor-quality, surface-mine reclamation plans. This proposal will result in improved reclamation as specified in RCW 78.44.091 through 78.44.141. It will reduce the number of mining operations that will reclaim according to poor-quality older-generation plans under a grandfathering provision in RCW 78.44. This checklist is applicable to revised reclamation plans that will result in:

- (a) Flatter slopes,
- (b) More sinuous, rounded topography,
- (c) Improved successional revegetation,
- (d) New wetlands, lakes, and/or drainages,
- (e) Topsoil/synthetic soil budgets and restoration,
- (f) Fill spotting, and compaction plans,
- (g) Rough natural-appearing cliffs [where permissible under state and local law],
- (h) Creating or enhancing fish and wildlife habitat,
- (i) Developing rough natural-appearing cliffs [where permissible under state and local law], and/or
- (j) Providing for segmental phased reclamation.

This checklist will not be used for proposals to revise reclamation plans that require any of the following approvals:

- (a) A rezone, modification of the approved subsequent use, mine-expansion, or other land-use determination of any local governments with jurisdiction,
- (b) A shorelines permit [RCW 90.58],
- (c) A metal mining permit [RCW 78.56], or
- (d) State water allocation laws [RCW 90.03, 90.44].